	JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General of the State of California BARRY D. LADENDORF,
	Deputy Attornoy Consus
	3 110 West A Street, Suite 700 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (619) 237-7811
	5 Attorneys for Complainant
	6
	7
	8 PERODE MAD
	BEFORE THE
	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
10	BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
1.	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
12	
13	
14	
15	Adainst:
16	JAMES D. KUNZMAN, M.D.) STIPULATION FOR
	San Diego California postar
17)
18	Physician's and Surgeon's) Certificate No. C 021489)
19	Respondent.
20)
21	IT IS MEDERA COLDULATOR
22	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the
23	parties to the above-entitled matter that the following
- 1	allegations are true.
24	1. Stephen R. Wilford, complainant herein and Acting
25	Executive Director of the Board of Medical Ouality Assurance of
26	the State of California .

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

26

27

059

the State of California, is represented by John K. Van De Kamp,

Attorney General of the State of California by Barry D. Ladendorf, Deputy Attorney General.

- 2. James D. Kunzman, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent") is represented by Gary Fields, Esq., who has been retained as his attorney in regard to the administrative action herein and that the respondent has counseled with Mr. Fields concerning the effect of this stipulation, which the respondent herein has carefully read and fully understands.
- 3. Respondent has received and read the accusation which is presently on file and pending as Case No. D-3074before the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance, State of California.
- 4. Respondent understands the nature of the charges alleged in the above-mentioned accusation and that said charges and allegations would constitute cause for imposing discipline upon respondent's medical license heretofore issued by the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.
- 5. Respondent and his counsel are aware of each of respondent's rights, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses who would testify against him, the right to present evidence in his favor and call witnesses on his behalf, or to testify himself, his right to contest the charges and allegations, and any other rights which may be accorded to him pursuant to California Adminfstrative Procedure Act (Gov. Code & 11500, et seq.) his right to reconsideration, review by the superior court and to appeal to any other court; that respondent

l understands that in signing this stipulation rather than 2 contesting the accusation, he is enabling the Division of 3 Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance to issue the following order from this stipulation without further process.

Respondent freely and voluntarily waives each and every one of the rights set forth hereinabove; that respondent admits that the following allegations are true and a violation of section 2234(b) (gross negligence) and 2234(d) (incompetence).

In May 1979, respondent treated patient L Home for a complaint of low back pain. During the course of treatment, respondent took x-rays of the patient. Respondent 13 told the patient there was a cancerous growth on his hip that should be removed immediately. During the surgical procedure on May 31, 1979, respondent removed a major portion of the normal ischial tuberosity and did not locate or remove the tumor. During the surgery, respondent also caused a fracture of the ischial ramous. Respondent never advised the patient of the error or subsequent injuries.

Based on the foregoing stipulations and recital, it is stipulated and agreed that the Division of Medical Quality may issue the following order as its decision in this case.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that License Number C-21489 issued to James D. Kunzman, M.D. is revoked. However, said

27

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for 5 years on the following terms and conditions:

A. Within 60 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall take and pass an oral clinical examination in general orthopedics and orthopedic surgery to be administered by the Division or its designee. If respondent fails this examination, respondent must wait three months between re-examinations, except that after three failures respondent must wait one year to take each necessary re-examination thereafter. The Division shall pay the cost of the first examination and respondent shall pay the costs of any subsequent examinations.

Respondent shall not practice medicine until respondent has passed this examination and has been so notified by the Division in writing.

- B. Within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval an educational program or course related to orthopedics and orthopedic surgery, which shall not be less than 40 hours per year, for each year of probation. This program shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure.
- C. During probation, respondent is (except for making a preliminary diagnosis) prohibited from diagnosing, treating or consulting on his or any other patient who has a bony tumor or cancer. If respondent believes that any of his patients have a bony tumor or a

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

cancer, he shall refer that patient to the appropriate medical specialist for a complete diagnostic workup and/or treatment.

Respondent shall maintain a log of all such referrals. The log shall include the patients name and the name of the physician to whom the patient was referred. This log shall be made available for inspection by the Division or its designee.

- D. Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.
- E. Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.
- F. Respondent shall comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.
- G. Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.
- H. In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the State, respondent must notify in writing the Division of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residency or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) 4

3

5 6

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

I. Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

If respondent violates probation, in any respect, the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.

I concur in the stipulation and order.

Dated:

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General of the State of California BARRY D. Ladendorf,

Deputy Attorney General

Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Complainant Board of Medical Ouality Assurance State of California

I concur in the stipulation and order.

Dated: 11/18/83

Attorney for/Respondent

I have read the above stipulation fully and have discussed it with my counsel. I understand that by its terms I will be waiving certain rights accorded me under California law. $4 \parallel$ I also understand that by its terms the Board of Medical Ouality Assurance will issue a Decision and Order on this stipulation whereby my license to practice medicine will be subject to certain terms and conditions. I agree to the above stipulation for settlement.

Respondent

Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality

Assurance in this matter and shall be effective on the 19th

DIVISION

, 1984.

The foregoing is adopted as the decision of the

IT IS SO ORDERED this 16th day of February

OF

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MEDICAL BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

Dated:

10

1

2

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

day of March

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

BDL:sol

1984.

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72

7.

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General of the State of California 2 BARRY D. LADENDORF, Deputy Attorney General 110 West "A" Street, Suite 700 3 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (619) 237-7811 4 5 Attorneys for Complainant 6 BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY 8 BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE 9 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 In the Matter of the Accusation NO. D-3074 12 Against: 13 JAMES D. KUNZMAN, M. D. 4202 Genesee, Suite 409 ACCUSATION 14 San Diego, California 92117 15 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. C 021489 16 17 Respondent. 18 Complainant, Vernon Leeper, alleges: 19 He is the Program Manager--Enforcement for the 20 Board of Medical Quality Assurance and makes and files this 21 accusation in his official capacity. 22 At all times herein mentioned James D. Kunzman, 23 M.D. (respondent) held physician's and surgeon's certificate No. 24 25 C 021489. 26 27

COURT PAPER BTATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (HEV. 8-72)

STATUTES

- 3. Business and Professions Code section 2220 (all references are to the Bus. & Prof. Code unless otherwise stated) provides the Division of Medical Quality (Division) may take action against all persons guilty of unprofessional conduct in violation of the Medical Practice Act.
- 4. Section 2227 provides, in part, that any licensee found guilty of unprofessional conduct may have his or her license revoked, suspended or placed on probation.
- 5. Section 2234 of the Code provides in pertinent part that the Division of Medical Quality shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct which includes but is not limited to:
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
 - "(d) Incompetence.
 - "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty . . . "

HATTER

- 6. At all times herein mentioned, Least Hamman was a patient of and under the care and treatment of respondent.
- 7. On or about May 3, 1979, Here went to respondent's office with a complaint of low back pain.

 Respondent conducted an examination, took x-rays and prescribed Darvoset-N, heat and restriction on activities.
- 8. On May 24, 1979, Here returned to respondent's office. Respondent took x-rays of Here's hip and told

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD 113 (REV. 8-72)

that there was a cancerous growth or tumor (osteoma) on the left hip which should be removed immediately.

- 9. On May 31, 1979, respondent performed major surgery on Hemmerly at Clairemont Community Hospital. Respondent described the procedure as an "excision of the tumor." In truth and in fact, respondent removed a major portion of the normal ischial tuberosity and did not locate or remove the tumor. Respondent never advised the patient of this error.
- Respondent is guilty of gross negligence in violation of section 2234(b) by reason of the following:
- A. Respondent failed to treat H complaint conservatively before resorting to surgical intervention.
- Respondent told the patient the tumor on his pelvis was cancerous when in truth and in fact, respondent knew or should have known the tumor was benign.
- C. Respondent failed to perform appropriate preoperative tests.
- During surgery, respondent failed to locate and remove the tumor and in fact removed a portion of the ischium.
- E. Respondent, during surgery, caused a fracture of the pubic ramus, injury to the pudendal nerve and injury to the hamstring.
- Respondent failed to advise and attempted to conceal from Head the surgical errors described above.

As a result, respondent is subject to discipline.

RT PAPER 6 OF CALIFORNIA 113 (REV. 8-72)

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 11. Respondent's conduct as described in paragraph 10 above is incompetence and a cause for discipline.
- 12. Respondent's representations to Head that the tumor was cancerous and needed to be removed and his failure to advise his patient of the surgical errors described above is dishonesty in violation of section 2234(e) and a cause for discipline.

WHEREFORE, complainant prays the Division hold a hearing on the aforementioned allegations and following said hearing:

- Suspend or revoke respondent's certificate;
- 2. Take such other action as may be necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

VERNON LEEPER

Program Manager--Enforcement Division of Medical Quality

Board of Medical Quality Assurance

Dated: July 6, 1983

BDL:sol

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)